

Citation for published version:

Sims, M, Maxwell, R & Gilmore, A 2013, 'Asthma admissions, smoking bans and administrative databases: Author's response', *Thorax*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 1166-1167. <https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204371>

DOI:

[10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204371](https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204371)

Publication date:

2013

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

This article has been accepted for publication in
Thorax following peer

review. The definitive copyedited, typeset version

Sims, M, Maxwell, R & Gilmore, A 2013, 'Asthma admissions, smoking bans and administrative databases: author's response' Thorax, vol 68, pp. 1166-1167 is available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2013-204371>

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Asthma admissions, smoking bans, and administrative databases - Author's Response

Michelle Sims¹, Roy Maxwell² and Anna B Gilmore¹

¹School for Health, and the UK Centre for Tobacco Control Studies, University of Bath,
Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY, UK.

² Public Health England, Grosvenor House, 149 Whiteladies Road, Bristol, BS8 2RA, UK.

Corresponding author: Dr Michelle Sims, Tobacco Control Research Group, Department for
Health, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY, U.K. Email: m.sims@bath.ac.uk.

Tel: 01225 385414

Key words: asthma, asthma epidemiology

Word count:424

The issue of the potential misclassification within Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) data of asthma for another condition such as COPD, or vice versa, raised by Kent and colleagues[1] is an important one and any impact that this may have should be considered.

Misclassification with resultant bias is a potential risk of many studies. However, the extent, or direction, to which bias may be introduced to a study which uses the recorded primary diagnosis from nationally collected data to ascertain trends in admissions is difficult to estimate.

Kent and colleagues' claim that asthma is misclassified in 9%-14% of cases is based on a single study[2] using data which is now at least 20 years old and came from only two hospitals in one region of England. As such it is highly unlikely to be representative of current national coding practice. Routinely collected data sets such as HES are continuously audited and the accuracy of clinical coding is assessed. We note that recent studies, though not specific to asthma or indeed other respiratory conditions, report that the introduction of measures such as Payment by Results has led to an improvement in the quality of coding in HES,[3, 4] and that 'current levels of reported accuracy suggest that routinely collected data are sufficiently robust to support their use for research and managerial decision-making.'[4] A 2008/09 audit of all acute NHS trusts in England reported a mean coding error for any primary diagnosis of 13.1%,[5] considerably smaller than the 28% and 45% reported by the two hospitals in the Dixon et al (1998) study for any primary diagnosis[2] suggesting there have been marked improvements in coding accuracy over time

The use of the primary diagnosis from the HES dataset is an established method of analysis[6, 7] to establish trends in emergency or elective admissions and is routinely used

for this purpose (e.g. [8]). While we acknowledge the potential issue of misclassification using the primary diagnosis of a patient's stay in hospital and the possibility that our study may, therefore, be subject to some bias, we note that it is only the coding error rates around the time of the legislation that will impact on our findings. These error rates though are likely to be considerably smaller than those quoted by Kent et al based on the Dixon et al (1998) study.[2] Moreover, the direction and magnitude will further depend on the differential effect that secondhand smoke has on asthma compared with the other conditions misclassified as asthma about which very little is known.

References

1. Kent B, Lane S, Moloney E. Asthma admissions, smoking bans, and administrative databases. *Thorax* 2013.
2. Dixon J, Sanderson C, Elliott P, et al. Assessment of the reproducibility of clinical coding in routinely collected hospital activity data: a study in two hospitals. *J Public Health Med* 1998;**20**:63-9.
3. Audit Commission. Right data, right payment. Annual report on the Payment by Results data assurance programme 2011/2012. 2012. <http://archive.audit-commission.gov.uk/auditcommission/health/paymentbyresults/reportsandstudies/Pages/rightdatapbr2012.aspx.html> (accessed 14 July 2013).
4. Burns EM, Rigby E, Mamidanna R, et al. Systematic review of discharge coding accuracy. *J Public Health* 2012;**34**:138-48.
5. Audit Commission. Payment by Results data assurance framework 2008/09. Supplementary analysis. 2009. <http://archive.audit-commission.gov.uk/auditcommission/health/paymentbyresults/reportsandstudies/p>

brdataassuranceframework200809/pages/default_copy.aspx.html (accessed 14 July 2013).

6. Millett C, Lee JT, Lavery AA, et al. Hospital Admissions for Childhood Asthma After Smoke-Free Legislation in England. *Pediatrics* 2013. Published Online First: 21 January 2013.

7. NHS Atlas of Variation in Healthcare for People with Respiratory Disease. Reducing unwarranted variation to increase value and improve quality. 2012.

<http://www.rightcare.nhs.uk/index.php/atlas/respiratorydisease/> (accessed 14 July 2013).

8. Asthma UK. Health and Social Care Bill. Memorandum submitted by Asthma UK (HS 34). 2011.

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmpublic/health/memo/m34.htm> (accessed 14 July 2013).